

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: 00152B7CAB24F76C85257881004E8CAC

From: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US

To: "Fredette, Thomas ERD" <Thomas.J.Fredette@usace.army.mil>

Delivered Date: 01/04/2010 02:35 PM EDT

Subject: Re: FW: revised modeling poster

thanks Tom - I thought that might have been the case. And 15,000 lbs makes that much better of a case.

Dave

▼ "Fredette, Thomas ERD" <Thomas.J.Fredette@usace.army.mil>

"Fredette, Thomas ERD" <Thomas.J.Fredette@usace.army.mil> 01/04/2010 02:15 PM		
	To	Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
	cc	
	Subject	FW: revised modeling poster

Dave,

Here is response from Paul. Based on that it appears the kg and lb got mixed up on the poster. Change your 7,000 lb to 15,000 and you will be in good shape.

Tom

-----Original Message-----

From: Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-EL-MS

Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 1:58 PM

To: Fredette, Thomas ERD; Ruiz, Carlos E ERDC-EL-MS

Subject: RE: revised modeling poster

I had computed 6642.679273 kg or 15,000 pounds of PCBS being dredged and the loss is 4.2 kg or 9 pounds.

For the third bullet I would prefer: This 9 pounds is stripped from the sediment into the overlying CAD cell water during placement and then moves from the lower CAD cell water into the overlying water column where it is transported from the CAD site; controls such as silt curtains and activated carbon can be used to limit migration beyond the CAD cell footprint.

Fourth bullet: once placed, a 3-foot cap would prevent virtually all of the PCBs from migrating out of the CAD cell for thousands of years

Paul

-----Original Message-----

From: Fredette, Thomas ERD
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 11:10 AM
To: Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-EL-MS; Ruiz, Carlos E ERDC-EL-MS
Subject: FW: revised modeling poster

Paul, Carlos;

Please take a look at the attached and see if it is a reasonable reflection of the report.

I do note that someplace his math is wrong in that 0.06% of 7000 is 4.2, so that will need to be rectified. The slide also states that PCBs will be prevented from migrating out of the cap. For practical purposes I don't think we would disagree, but that is slightly different than what I recall the report saying (tens of thousands of years). Let me know.

Thanks,

Tom

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 11:07 AM
To: Fredette, Thomas ERD
Cc: Catri.Cynthia@epamail.epa.gov; Peterson.David@epamail.epa.gov;
Ng.ManChak@epamail.epa.gov; Brill.Larry@epamail.epa.gov;
Falvey.Jeanethe@epamail.epa.gov; stanley.elainet@epamail.epa.gov;
White.Kimberly@epamail.epa.gov; Nelson.William@epamail.epa.gov;
Bergen.Barbara@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: revised modeling poster

Hi Tom - happy new year. Could you give this revised modeling summary poster a quick review, and forward to Paul and Carlos to make sure they're comfortable with my summary? Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks - Dave

(Embedded image moved to file: pic14824.jpg)